

AUG 09 2006

Serial No. 10/677,398
Amendment and Response to Office Action
Mailed: 10 March 2006**Remarks / Arguments**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 12 as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (U.S. Patent No 5,511,190). By this paper, the Applicant has amended claims 1 and 12. Claims: 1 - 12 are now pending. The amendments to the Claims do not add any new matter. In view of the forgoing amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sharma et al.

Claim 12

With respect to claim 12, applicant respectfully submits Sharma fails to teach “*a non-blocking grouping mechanism*”. Further, Sharma fails to teach “data being returned to the user substantially concurrently with the rest of the data being processed”. This is evidenced by the phrase “The end of file flag EOF is a Boolean that indicates when set that the last record from the table T1 has been read, at which point the group function reports to the communications interface all group data aggregated in the group table GT ...[emphasis added]” (Col. 8, L. 36 – 40). As one skilled in the art is aware, a mechanism which fails to return output until all input has been received is known as a blocking mechanism.

Serial No. 10/677,398
Amendment and Response to Office Action
Mailed: 10 March 2006

Applicant also notes Sharma fails to teach "a select mechanism by which a prescribed number of output groups are requested by the user, wherein operations of all of the non-blocking grouping mechanism, the overflow mechanism, and the return mechanism are halted when the requested prescribed number of output groups is reached." As evidenced by previous citing of Sharma's teaching of a blocking mechanism.

Claim 1

[0001] With respect to claim 1, applicant respectfully submits Sharma fails to teach "a non-blocking grouping mechanism" and also fails to teach "*returns ... entries of data substantially concurrently with processing following grouping of data.*" This is again evidenced by Sharma's teaching of a blocking mechanism. Applicant has also amended claim 1 to include the limitation of returning "distinct entries" since as applicant discussed in the application "*[With Hash] grouping devices that provide aggregate grouping, no useful data is provided to (or accessible by) the user until all of the input rows of data is analyzed and returned. [emphasis added]*" (Application, Para. 0002)

Claims 5 and 8

With respect to claims 5 and 8, applicant submits Sharma fails to teach "*returning distinct entries of data from the input entries of data to the user substantially concurrently with the receiving input entries of data.*" As evidenced by previous arguments.

Claim 9

With respect to claim 9, applicant submits Sharma fails to teach "*returning the data in a non-blocking fashion and in the case of overflow, ensuring that the user eventually receives the correct remaining rows.*" As Sharma was using a blocking mechanism to process data, there

Serial No. 10/677,398
Amendment and Response to Office Action
Mailed: 10 March 2006

was no need to track rows returned to ensure duplicates which were overflowed were not returned as is the case of the current application. Therefore Sharma failed to teach this point as it was not an issue for Sharma's blocking implementation.

Claim 2

With respect to claim 2, applicant submits Sharma fails to teach a "*non-blocking grouping mechanism*" as evidenced in previous arguments.

Claim 6

With respect to claim 6, applicant submits while Sharma does teach "*accommodate[ing] memory overflow by selected portions ... being flushed to a secondary memory,*" Sharma fails to teach all limitation of the base claim 5 as argued above.

Claim 3

With respect to claim 3, applicant refers to previous arguments regarding claim 1 on which claim 3 depends.

Claim 7

With respect to claim 7, applicant refers to previous arguments regarding claim 5 on which claim 7 depends.

Claim 4

Examiner states "*With respect to claim 5, Sharma discloses wherein the primary memory being primary Random Access Memory (RAM) [Col. 5, Lines 9-15; Fig. 1].*" Applicant assumes

Serial No. 10/677,398
Amendment and Response to Office Action
Mailed: 10 March 2006

an error was made and examiner meant to refer to claim 4. To which, applicant refers to previous arguments regarding claim 1 on which claim 4 depends.

Claims 9 – 11

Applicant refers examiner to previous arguments regarding Sharma's failure to teach "*non-blocking*".


Serial No. 10/677,398
Amendment and Response to Office Action
Mailed: 10 March 2006

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner wishes to resolve any other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9 August 2006


Kevin M. Jones
Registration No. 58,827
(281) 514-7828

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400